

|   |                        |                     |  |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|   | 09/892,242             | QI ET AL.           |  |
|   | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|   | Ponnoreay Pich         | 2135                |  |

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** Final Rejection

 (1) Ponnoreay Pich.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Lori Gordon.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 8/15/06
**Time:** 11AM
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

112, second paragraph rejections of claims 3, 25, and 39-40

Claims discussed:

3, 25, and 39-40

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner stated that in discussing the claims with two primary examiners as well as having considered what the prior art teaches, it appears that because claims 3, 25, and 39-40 state that the cryptography engine in the independent claims is a DES engine, the claims are indefinite since DES is a recognized standard while the engine defined by applicant in the independent claims is instead an improvement upon a standard. An improved engine cannot be also called the standard engine. The examiner recommended cancelling claims 3, 25, and 39-40 to expedite allowance of the application. Ms. Gordon disagrees with the 112, second paragraph rejections and believes that the engine defined in the independent claims is also a DES engine. Due to no agreement being reached, the examiner stated that the examiner will mail out a final office action with the rejection of claims 3, 25, and 39-40..